1900

(Bowringpet)

File No 61-10

Serial Nos 33 & 34

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Serial Nos 33 & 34

Part B for Feb 4, 1912

SUBJECT

Explanation of the amildar of Krishnarayapet taluk for having retained the services of the octroi peon without proper authority

33 From the Dy Comr, Bangalore, no 384 & dd 2-12 Submits the explanation of the amildar of Krishnarayapet taluk for having retained the services of the octroi peon for the Krishnarayapet Market without proper authority

34 to Do, no 6040 & 27-2-12 Records serial no 33 supra

M N Anandalwar

12 3 12

G R S 58

4476

GRS. 11] 1911-12.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Rural)

NOTES

File No 61-10

FILE HEADING

Establishments of municipalities in the Mysore Districts

From

The Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District

No 389 Dated 10-2-12 Received 12 2-12

Diary No 4476 | Enclos 1 | Spare Copies | Serial No 33

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

Submits, with reference to G O No 10733-4 ML 61-10-26 & 29-6 11, the explanation of the amildar of Krishnarajpet-taluk for having retained the services of the Octroi peon for the Krishnarajpet-municipality referred to in the said order without proper authority

NOTES AND ORDERS

Submitted with a draft

Hon (158) 14 2 12 1st Cr) 17 2 12. Hue

Draft approd by 2nd Cr

Hq(52) 24/2/12

Issue

27/2/12

Hue 27 2 12

NOTES—First Sheet

GPB—80 000—12 8 11

C2

G R. S 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat

Fils No. 61 of 191 D

Serial No.	
364	La Ste Bx Canada Rapare St. No 60408 27 2 1912. Records Book 1 No 33

NOTE—Contin. sheet.

GPB—20,000—20-1-12

190

From

Dr. Kantaraj Urs Esq., B.A

Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District

To

C.R. Balakrishnamma Iyer Esq., B.A

Secy to Govt. of Mysore,
Gen. & Rev. Depts

Dated 10th December 1914

Despatched

Received

General No 389
No

Enclosure No. 1

Submits Kurubaru
pet Taluk Amildars
explanation re-a-re

No. 37
Enc. No

Office of the Deputy Commissioner
Mysore District,
Dated Mysore Camp 10th February 1912.

From

M. Krishnaraj Urs

Esq., B.A

Deputy Commissioner, Mysore District

To

C.S Balasundaram Iyer Esq, B.A

Offg. Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

As called for in para 2 of Government Proceedings No 10733-4/Rev 61-10 dated 29-6-1911. I have the honor to submit herewith Copy of Krishnarajpet Taluk Amildar's explanation, received with French Rocks Division Assistant Commissioner's yadi No 469/5207 dated 3-6-1911. The Amildar explains that the manager was continued in service year after year that he was in employment when he took charge of the Taluk, that provision had been made in the budget for 1910-11 and that he was allowed to remain in service so that the collection work may be attended properly. His explanation may be accepted. It may also be stated here that though the Retrenchment was entertained without sanction of Government

No

No payment was made to him for the period during which he was in Services.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Deputy Commissioner
Th Sanjore District

Submitted to the Sub Division Officer French Rocks with reference to the Deputy Commissioner's Order No. 4059/ F. 354 dated 26-5-11.

---------- Encl & ind 61-W 8233

This manegar was appointed in the year 1908 and was continued year after year till now. When I took charge of this Taluk on the 27th July 1910, he was in employ as a manegar so that he was appointed for this year i e., 1910-11 prior to my my taking charge of the Taluk by my predeccessor Mr. H.S.Venkatachar. The budget for the year 1910-11 was passed in the Municipal Meeting held on 6-2-1910 and it was submitted to the District office on 8-2-1910.This budget estimate provided for the pay of a manegar. As the man was in employ when I took charge of the Taluk and as the Budget estimate sent from this office on 8-2-1910 provided for the manegar, the only inference that I could draw was that the man's appointment was continued provisionally pending formal budget sanction as all other Municipal establishment such as sweepers and lighting contracts. Besides, the pay bill of the manegar for the twelve months of 1909-10 was received passed on 31-7-1910. This also led me to believe that the manegar was continued under proper authority. Then there was was Cir. No. 65 dated 13-10-1910 calling for the opinion of the Municipal Board as to the security that may be demanded of the manegar and the Board's resolution dated 31-10-10 requiring that a security of Rs. 50/- may be taken from him. This was communicated duly and this was also ~~confirmed~~ Conformed me in the belief that the manegar continued under proper orders and with the consent of the Board.

The Municipal budget was received sanctioned so late as 5-12-1910 and there it is ~~stated~~ stated that payment to the temporary peon from 1st July 1910 should be made with due sanction Vide remarks in page 3 of Government Pro. No. 3207-13/ M1. 100-10-2 dated Bangalore 2nd October 1910. From these remarks I inferred that to draw the pay of the manegar Government sanction was needed. So I prepared the bills for six months from 1st July 1910 to 31st December

December 1910 for submission to Government for obtaining sanction for payment. The previous year's sanctioned budget stated with refere ence to this peon that he should not be entertained without Govern- ment sanction. This year the budget stated that Government sanction was needed only for payment.

Under the circumstances explained it will be drawn seen that I am not responsible for entertaining this manegar who was already in employ when I took charge and that I permitted his continuance for the reasons quoted above and in order that octroi collection may be attended to on shandy and other days as the patel and shanbogue who were doing this work prior to the appointment of the manegar for com- mission, gave it up on the latter's appointment, as they got no com- mission for the same.

I therefore request that under the circumstances mentioned the pay/bill may kindly be submitted to Government for favour of formal sanction as early as possible as the year is to close soon and the amount provided in the budget may lapse if not expended before the close of the year. I append herewith another bill for the five months from 1st January to 31st May 1911, also for favour of kind sanction.

I have issued orders to the manegar dispensing with his ser- vices from the 1st of July 1911.

In order to do octroi collection work and to supervise over the scavenging and lighting staff of the Municipality, the Municipal council has passed a resolution on 31-5-11 opining that in place of the manegar for whom the budget for 1911-12 has made provision, a mut- saddy on Rs. 10/- per mensem may be appointed. Copy of the reso- lution is enclosed here ith for favour of kind perusal.

It is regarded that Government may be moved to sanction the appointment of a mutsaddy as per resolution of the Municipal Board as the increasing needs of the Municipality require one. The add- itional amount of Rs. 50/- required may be met from the Municipal

sur-

surplus.

(Signed) R.A.Narasimhaiengar,
Ag. Amildar.

Dated 1-6-11.

" C O P Y "

Deputy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

H.K.S.

6

G R S. 28]

File No 61-10

Serial No. 34

Diary No of letter replied to 44476

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT
(ML)

READ—

Letter No 389 dated the 10th February 1912 from the Dy Comr, Mysore District, submitting, with reference to G. O. No 10738-4 ML 61-10-26 dated the 27th June 1911, ~~Gross Services No.~~

, the 19

Date of issue 20-2-12

Signed by M Kuiz

the explanation of the amildar of the Krishnarajpet taluk for having retained the services of the Octroi peon for the Krishnarajpet municipality referred to in the said order without ODAT

SUBJECT

proper authority and that under
the circumstances explained
the explanation may be accepted

Order thereon as follows 10

Recorded

Secretary

To the Dy. Comm. Mysore 20th

Hon(SR)
14-2-12

3/2-2-12

2/2/12.

Copies sent
16-2-12